

## **REMARKS**

In the Final Office Action of November 12, 2009, the drawings were again objected to “because conventional features illustrated in the drawing as rectangular boxes must be labeled for understanding in this application. See 37 CFR 1.83(a).” In addition, claims 1-9, 11-17 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatenable over U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0007473 A1 (hereinafter “Strong et al.”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,577,229 (hereinafter “Bonneau et al.”) and further in view of U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2002/0024421 A1 (“Kang”). Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatenable over Strong et al. in view of Bonneau et al. and Kang, and in further view of U.S. Patent Number 5,610,947 (hereinafter “Balasubramanian et al.”).

With respect to the drawing objection, Applicants respectfully submit that requiring labels to “make the drawings and the claim language easier to, read and understand the applicant’s invention,” as asserted on page 3 of the Office Action, is not valid under PCT Rule 11.11 since making “the drawings and the claim language easier to, read and understand the applicant’s invention” cannot be equated to being “**indispensible** for understanding” (emphasis added), as required under PCT Rule 11.11. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that providing labels in boxes is not required in the current application and respectfully request that the drawing objection be withdrawn.

With respect to the Section 103 rejections, a telephone interview between the undersigned attorney and Examiner Nabil H. Syed was conducted on March 30, 2010. In the telephone interview, proposed amendments to the independent claims 1, 5, 9 and 14 were discussed. As a result of the discussion, Examiner Syed agreed that the proposed amendments to the independent claims 1, 5, 9 and 14 would overcome the current rejections. However, Examiner Syed noted that further searching may be required. Examiner Syed also informed the undersigned attorney that his supervisor, Brian Zimmerman, has agreed to this understanding. However, no agreement was reached to the allowability of the pending claims.

Pursuant to the agreement reached during the telephone interview, Applicants have amended the independent claims 1, 5, 9 and 14 to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the cited references of Strong et al., Bonneau et al., and Kang. In addition, claims 5, 9 and 16 have been amended to correct minor informalities. In particular, claim 5 has been amended to remove “-” in front of “the first signal-processing means” on line 19. Similarly, claim 9 has been amended to remove “-” in front of “the microprocessor” on line 14. Claim 16 has been amended to add “the” in front of “energy-supply signal.”

In view of the claim amendments, Applicants respectfully request that the pending claims 1-9 and 11-19 be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,  
Kunkat et al.

Date: April 12, 2010

By: /thomas h. ham/  
Thomas H. Ham  
Registration No. 43,654  
Telephone: (925) 249-1300